

Atty. Dkt. No. 035451-0185 (3731.Palm)

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

In the specification, Applicants have amended paragraph [0001] to include application serial numbers of related applications.

Claim 16 is requested to be cancelled without prejudice.

Claims 15, 17 and 18 are currently being amended.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-15, 17-29 are now pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

In Section 1 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-14 and 22-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyerson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,579,487). Applicants first remark that the Meyerson et al. patent is not applicable in that it discloses a work slate computer, whereas what Applicants' have claimed is a "handheld computing device" in independent claims 1, 22 and 26. The recitation of a "handheld computer" should be construed more narrowly than including a work slate computer as construed by the Examiner. Terms of the claims should be given their plain meaning. Here, Applicants are concerned with the construction of the words "handheld computer" by the Examiner. The Examiner has construed the work slate computer which is disclosed in Meyerson et al. as a handheld computer. Applicants, however, disagree. In response, Applicants submit as Exhibit A (attached hereto) a

Atty. Dkt. No. 035451-0185 (3731.Palm)

printout from the website dictionary.com which indicates that a "handheld computer" is "a computer small enough to be carried in your pocket." A work slate computer as disclosed in Meyerson et al., is not one which can conventionally be carried in your pocket. Applicants also submit as Exhibit B (attached), an alternative definition of the term "handheld" as it refers to computers. Exhibit B comes from the website SearchMobileComputing.com. The site describes a handheld computer as "a computer that can conveniently be stored in a pocket (of sufficient size) and used while you are holding it." Thus, it is clear that the plain meaning of "handheld computer" should not be construed to include work slate computers, as the Examiner has suggested. Further still, it should be appreciated that the Applicant may be his or her own lexicographer as long as the meaning assigned to the term is not repugnant to the terms' well known usage. In re Hill, 161 F.2d 367, 73 USPQ 482 (CCPA 1947). Accordingly, Applicants refer the Examiner to the specification which states at paragraph [0003] "the size of the handheld computing device is generally compact and correspondingly, the visual display is smaller than the size of a standard computer monitor. The small size of the screen allows handheld computing devices to be portable, but less than ideal for viewing complex images of documents. The small size of the screen has necessitated that handheld computing devices focus on displaying abbreviated or simplistic content." In contrast, the work slate computer of Meyerson et al. has a display which is relatively large and could easily be used for viewing complex images of documents, e.g. Further, Applicants refer the Examiner to paragraph [0022] which states that a handheld computer can be "a handheld personal digital assistant (PDA), a wireless mobile phone, a pager, or any such device." As is well known, all of these devices are approximately the size which could be conveniently carried in your pocket. Thus, it is clear that the Applicants have defined the term "handheld computer" within specified constraints which would not include the work slate computer of Meyerson et al. Work slate computers, such as those disclosed in Meyerson et al. conventionally do not fit in a pocket. Thus, for these reasons, the Meyerson et al. patent is not applicable.

Further, in regard to independent claims 1, 22, and 26, the Examiner indicates that the properties of the detachable visual display unit are communicated to the handheld computing

Atty. Dkt. No. 035451-0185 (3731.Palm)

device processor. The Examiner indicates that each removable module of Meyerson et al. includes some provision for enabling the type to be identified. The disclosure of Meyerson et al. does not, however, disclose, teach, or suggest that the particular properties of the display unit are provided by the display unit to the processor. This is of particular relevance in that not only is the specific type of display used, but the properties of the display that are vitally important. For example, "visual display unit 150 may include a serial/memory device that stores the display characteristics, including, but not limited to, display size, resolution, type, timings, and other settings. See, e.g., paragraph [0030]. This is very important in that one may simply swap, e.g., a monochrome display for a color high resolution display which has certain properties. If the properties are not communicated to the handheld device, then it is necessary that the handheld device retain a database of properties associated with different types of displays. However, this is inconvenient in a case that the display being coupled to the handheld device was not available when the handheld device was first manufactured and therefore the database would need to be updated for each new display coming to market. For example, this may happen when a user seeks to upgrade a display. See, e.g., paragraph [0007].

Accordingly, for the reasons provided above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 22, and 26, and their respective dependent claims are allowable.

Additionally, Applicants add that in dependent claim 2, Applicants claimed a wireless communication interface between the detachable visual display unit and the processing unit. The Examiner states that this limitation is taught in Meyerson et al. in col. 10, lines 17-20. However, Applicants disagree because what is taught in Meyerson et al. is a wireless interface for the docking positions which are for external attachments or removable modules, not for the display unit 64a. Applicants read col. 10, lines 17-20 as disclosing an interface for auxiliary modules or external attachments, not for frontal display 64a. Accordingly, dependent claim 2 is not obvious under Meyerson et al.

With regard to independent claim 4, Applicants disagree that a flexible display is taught by Meyerson et al. Applicants describe a flexible display unit which may have flexible

Atty. Dkt. No. 035451-0185 (3731.Palm)

characteristics such as an e-paper or bi-stable type of display (See e.g., paragraph [0027]). The sheet unit 64a is described as planar, but nowhere is it described or should sheet unit 64a be seen as flexible. Sheet unit 64a is described as an LCD device, not a flexible display device as taught by Applicants. Accordingly, dependent claim 4 is therefore allowable and it is not obvious in view of Meyerson et al.

With regard to dependent claim 5, Applicants respectfully submit that Meyerson et al. does not teach the use of a detachable visual display unit that is expandable. This is simply a feature that is not disclosed in Meyerson et al. and is clearly shown in Applicants' FIGURE 2. Accordingly, dependent claim 5 is not obvious in view of Meyerson et al. and therefore is allowable.

With regard to dependent claims 8-13, all of these claims are directed to the type of visual display unit being used. None of the types recited in any of claims 8-13 have been disclosed in Meyerson et al. Accordingly, Meyerson et al. does not disclose, teach, or suggest the use of such visual display units as conceived by Applicants. Therefore, dependent claims 8-13 are allowable over Meyerson et al.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

In Section 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 15-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Meyerson et al. Applicants have amended independent claim 15 to recite that "the communication port is capable of receiving information representative of properties of the detachable visual display unit." Applicants respectfully submit that in light of the amendment to claim 15, claim 15 should be allowed in view of the rationale provided with regard to independent claim 1 above. Thus, claim 15 and its dependent claims are allowable.

* * * * *

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

Atty. Dkt. No. 035451-0185 (3731.Palm)

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1447.

Respectfully submitted,

Date March 15, 2004By Alistair K. Chan

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 26371
Telephone: (414) 297-5730
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Alistair K. Chan
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,603